UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/596,045	05/26/2006	Maria Josephina Engelen	PHNL031426US	1139	
	7590 04/22/201 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER			
P. O. Box 3001			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/22/2010	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/596,045	ENGELEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LAdillilei	Ait oilit	

	MAIKHANH NGUYEN	2176						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,								
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			04400					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	•						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	porrosponding number of finally rois	octod claims						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)					
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		mphane, anomamone (i	. 02 02 1/1					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)   will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none.								
Claim(s) objected to: <i>none</i> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowen	na hanauna:					
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.								
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13.								
	/Laurie Ries/							
	Primary Examiner							
	Technology Center 2100	)						
	21 April 2010							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues in substance that O'Rourke does not teach "the validate software is executable separately and independently from the processing software."

In response, O'Rourke teaches the validate software is executable separately and independently from the processing software (controller 15 validates that the user of processing device 10 is authorized to access the information selected for transfer (e.g., via password verification) and inhibits communication of those selected information elements for which the user is denied access. Processing device 10 (in conjunction with controller 15) inhibits acquisition and storing by device 20 of selected information elements for which the user is denied access in order to prevent their communication to processing device 20...controller 15 of processing device 10 validates that the user of processing device 20, the intended recipient of the information, is authorized to access the information selected for transfer. Controller 15 does this based on pre-stored authorization information (e.g. a password) or on information communicated to processing device 10 from device 20 identifying the device 20 user as an authorized recipient of the selected information elements. Upon unsuccessful validation, controller 15 inhibits transfer of the selected information. Upon successful validation, controller 15 in step 230 establishes communication with portable processing device 20 via interface 17 using the communication settings previously selected in step 205. Controller 15 in step 235 communicates the selected information elements together with the associated patient identification information elements (previously identified in step 205 to accompany a data transfer) on the established communication link) [Col.4, line 37-Col.5, line 14].

.